



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/762,550	02/09/2001	Akihiro Funakoshi	053466/0299	5276

22428 7590 08/16/2006

FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

SPECTOR, LORRAINE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1647

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/762,550

Applicant(s)

FUNAKOSHI ET AL.

Examiner

Lorraine Spector, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2006.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### **DETAILED ACTION**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/5/2006 has been entered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

Art Unit: 1647

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 14- 26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al., Cancer Research 53(4):851-6, February 1993, and/or Kishimoto et al., EP 0 791 359 A1, either or both references in view of Gross et al., Hepato-Gastroenterol. 40:522-530, cited by applicants, and Farkas et al., Neuroscience Letters 242(3):147-150. 2/20/98 for reasons of record in the previous Office Action mailed 10/6/2003.

Applicants arguments in the amendment filed 6/30/2006 have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive. Applicants once again assert that the Examiner's statement that "the person of ordinary skill in the art would not expect that suppression of the effects of a single cytokine would *completely stop or prevent* (emphasis added) a condition that is due to the effects of multiple cytokines" teaches against a reasonable expectation of success. This argument has been fully considered but is not deemed persuasive because applicants are mis-applying the Examiner's statement. The claims are drawn to treatment, not complete amelioration or absolute prevention. The distinction is crucial. There is no question that the person of ordinary skill in the art would expect at least a reduction in symptoms due to the inhibition of IL-6 activity, as evidenced by the primary references. The issue that it is unpredictable that one could *completely stop or prevent* acute pancreatitis is not germane. Applicants position if further belied by WO 96/40966, provided by applicants, which clearly demonstrates an expectation in the art of success at treating IL-6 associated conditions with anti-IL-6 therapeutics. It is noted

Art Unit: 1647

that the claims are drawn to “treating” or “reducing” pancreatitis, not absolute prevention or amelioration (which would not be considered to be enabled). It is further noted that the examples in the specification merely show that injection of anti-IL-6 receptor mAb *prior to induction* of acute pancreatitis “resulted in improvement” of chemically induced pancreatitis (pages 29-30). Again in Example 2, at page 30, the antibody was administered *prior to* administration of caerulein, and “caused a pronounced improvement effect”. Thus, applicants arguments pertaining to absolute amelioration or prevention are (a) not directed to limitations found in the claims, and (b) are not supported by the specification as originally filed.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

M. Mihara et al., Clinical and Experimental Immunology 112(3) :397-402, published June, 1998, disclose that “IL-6 receptor blockage inhibits the onset of autoimmune kidney disease in NXB/WF<sub>1</sub> mice” (see title).

### ***Conclusion***

No claim is allowed.

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action

Art Unit: 1647

after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Lorraine M. Spector. Dr. Spector can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. at telephone number 571-272-0893.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, please contact the Examiner's supervisor, Ms. Brenda Brumback, at telephone number 571-272-0961.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in

Art Unit: 1647

the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant does submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by applicant or applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers in the Office.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to 571-273-8300. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to **571-273-0893**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lorraine Spector". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Lorraine Spector, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner